To: FCC From: Patricia Burke

Re: 25-133 Delete Delete Delete Date:

April 8, 2025

The FCC has unlawfully ignored the 2021 Court remand regarding the adequacy of its radio frequency exposure guidelines, which have not been revised since 1996.

The U.S. Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia Circuit found that the FCC failed to address: impacts of long-term wireless exposure, impacts to children, the testimony of people injured by wireless radiation, impacts to wildlife and the environment, and impacts to the developing brain and reproduction.

Federal Court Orders Federal Communications Commission to Explain Why it Ignored Scientific Evidence Showing Harm from Wireless Radiation - Environmental Health Trust

“The court held that the FCC failed to respond to “record evidence that exposure to RF radiation at levels below the Commission’s current limits may cause negative health effects unrelated to cancer.” Further, the agency demonstrated “a complete failure to respond to comments concerning environmental harm caused by RF radiation.”

The FCC has ignored the Court’s remand.

The FCC was created, "for the purpose of the national defense”

The FCC has a conflict of interest because, as the 2008 Federal Communications Commission Fiscal Year 2008 Performance and Accountability Report states, “Furthermore, the Act provides that the FCC was created, "for the purpose of the national defense," and, "for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communications.’ *https://transition.fcc.gov/Reports/ar2008.pdfhttps://transition.fcc.gov/Reports/ar2008.pdf*

(Promoting safety of life and property has been translated into installing infrastructure to support First Responders, with wide-scale abdication of duty for incorporating evidence indicative on non-thermal effects of non-ionizing radiation into safety testing for devices and infrastructure, and the effects of ubiquitous, juxtaposed, chronic and cumulative exposures.)

This testimony pertains to the FCC's abdication of responsibility to protect children

This includes but is not limited to cradle-to-grave exposures, baby monitors, cell phones not adequately tested for different ages and skull sizes including the developing brain, school Wi-Fi exposures, and infrastructure proximal to homes, playgrounds, daycares, hospitals and other sensitive areas.

Authority and responsibility for the safety of children relative to technology use and ubiquitous environmental exposures should be deleted from the FCC's domain, and assigned to another agency with the sole authority to protect children's health.

Of particular concern are inappropriate testing protocols, children's unique vulnerabilities, the contribution of environmental exposures to sky-rocketing chronic illness, damage to the Blood Brain Barrier, and long-term implications for fertility.

Of note:

A 1996 Paper: Prof Om Gandhi: O. P. Gandhi, G. Lazzi and C. M. Furse, "Electromagnetic absorption in the human head and neck for mobile telephones at 835 and 1900 MHz," in IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques, vol. 44, no. 10, pp. 1884-1897, Oct. 1996, doi: 10.1109/22.539947. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/539947?arnumber=539947

We are now beyond the point of precaution and protection of vulnerable groups

As noted in the 2020 Consensus Statement of UK and International Medical and Scientific Experts and Practitioners on Health Effects of Non-Ionising Radiation (NIR*)*

"In truth, we are now beyond the point of precaution and protection of vulnerable groups is an emergency. RFR has been repeatedly shown to cause widespread, multisystem health detriment,67 and effects on the immune system have been demonstrated in some peer reviewed published studies.108 Given the extraordinary pressure on public health provision in 2020, the simple measure of halting further RFR exposures via 5G is a reasonable and proportionate measure in order to optimise the biological resilience of the population." (Footnotes are live at link)

https://phiremedical.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/2020-Non-Ionising-Radiation-Consensus-Statement.pdf

Clear Human Rights Violations

According to PHIRE, Physicians' Health Initiative for Radiation and Environment (PHIRE):

“There are clear human rights violations, particularly for vulnerable groups1. In essence many of these also apply to any individual who does not consent to exposure in their home, place of work or public building and yet is being given no choice. People all over the world are making their unwillingness to be exposed abundantly clear via protests, letters and where there is resource, legal actions2,3,4,5,6,7. At its core, this is an issue of consent and there can be no defensible argument for forcibly exposing those who do not consent.

That is a breach of the Nuremburg Code as well as numerous Human Rights. The ‘Rights of a Child’ and unborn child are currently also being contravened by these exposures and parents who strive to protect their children currently have no avenue to achieve this without complete public isolation. Indeed, they may even be unable to prevent their children’s exposures in their own property given the penetration of EMF over large distances and through walls. There are adults and children who have severe acute symptoms and in some cases they can prove life threatening. Additionally, the extreme measures some are forced to take to avoid exposures (such as primitive camping for example) can also lead to lack of access to medical care, social support, isolation from basic necessities such as food, water and shelter and to hostile exposures such as extremes of temperature.”

It is noteworthy also that as individuals prove they have been harmed by RFR exposures, (which is certainly already happening8), there is also likely no insurance coverage, which enhances the injustice of this situation. Following in depth analysis of the scientific literature and thorough risk assessment, underwriters are refusing to cover RFR related injury claims, which they consider to be ‘high impact’9. Governmental bodies could therefore be forced to ‘self insure’. This would present the very unethical situation that the taxpayer could ultimately pay for health damages incurred by exposures that they never consented to and in many cases actively refused. (Footnotes are live at link)

https://phiremedical.org/human-rights-and-precautionary-principle/https://phiremedical.org/human-rights-and-precautionary-principle/

United Nations Human Rights: Convention on the Rights of the Child

“Bearing in mind that, as indicated in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, "the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth [] Article 3 1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child

Children's Nervous Systems Are Not Fully Developed

This is a critical issue as children are not fully developed, especially with regards to their brain and nervous system connections. Children's reproductive systems are also at risk with close exposure to wireless devices. Pediatrician, Dr. Lisa Thornton discusses health impacts and concerns with cell phones. Some schools, especially in Switzerland and Germany, are moving toward fiberoptic and wired systems to protect both the health of as well as the privacy of students. Many schools in the U.S. are beginning to prohibit cell phone use of students during school hours. Universities and law schools are banning the use of laptop computers in class due to distraction. Despite these efforts many K-12 schools in the United States embrace and are expanding wireless and online technologies, including in charter schools.

https://safetech4santarosa.org/schools-children/

FCC Safety Guidelines for Wireless Radiation are Outdated

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) guidelines for RF EMR are based on a short 30 minute exposure to a device and do not take into account cumulative long term health effects, additive effects of multiple devices, synergistic effects with other toxic exposures, and sensitive populations such as those with chronic illness or electrosensitivity. FCC safety guidelines are also based only on heat and not biological effects identified in research studies. Scientists worldwide who have studied radio frequency radiation have called for reevaluation of the outdated safety standards set by the FCC in 1996 with the passage of the Telecommunications Act. Dr. Martin Pall has collected a list of 170 reviews showing non-thermal effects which are not considered relevant by the FCC, who determines harm only from thermal heating of tissue- here.
Cindy Sage (BioInitiative Report) has compiled another list of Low-level effects from RFR and listed effects and measurements of RFR- here.

https://safetech4santarosa.org/schools-children/

Inadequate Modeling and Unrealistic Testing: We "Measure" Cell Phone Safety on an Inanimate Model Representing a 220-pound Male's Head

Testing the safety of cellphones on a model that replicates the measurement for a male military recruit's head filled with the equivalent of Jello would only be appropriate if a child's head was the size of male military recruit's and filled with something inanimate, like Jello.

When drugs were tested on male military recruits and then prescribed to women and children, the misguided science killed people. The wireless industry has taken the cognitive error even further by testing cell phones for 6 minutes by taking the core temperature of an inanimate dummy that represents the dimensions of a male military recruit's head, filled with the equivalent of Jello to represent "average

tissue" – a ridiculous assumption, especially with what is known about glioblastomas and other forms of brain cancer. See https://www.wearenotsam.com/

"Firstly, Sam, the test dummy, consists of a plastic head. It has no tissue, organs or bones, torso, arms or legs and bears no physical resemblance or similarities to an actual human." "The plastic test dummy head is based on a male of 100kg and 6ft, and this body type and size represents 3% of the actual population. There is no allowance for the 97% of the population who are not in this range, and it is widely proven that children absorb twice the radiation of an adult." - Learn more at https://www.wearenotsam.com/

Children are More Vulnerable

"Children have smaller heads than adults. Cell phones and wireless radiation can go deeper into their brains because children have a shorter distance from their skull to their brain center. Government regulations were based on a 220-pound man's head, not a child's head. Our skulls actually slow down wireless as it moves into our brain. The thicker the skull, the more roadblocks to the wireless radiation moving forward. Since children have much thinner skulls than adults, they have less protection. Research shows that children can absorb up to ten times the radiation in the bone marrow of their skulls than adults.
"Children are not little adults and are disproportionately impacted by all environmental exposures, including cell phone radiation. Current FCC standards do not account for the unique vulnerability and use patterns specific to pregnant women and children. It is essential that any new standard for cell phones or other wireless devices be based on protecting the youngest and most vulnerable populations to ensure they are safeguarded throughout their lifetimes."- American Academy of Pediatrics"

https://ehtrust.org/research-on-childrens-vulnerability-to-cell-phone-radio-frequency-radiation/

As noted by PHIRE:

Children are more vulnerable due to multiple factors:

Children absorb more radiation:

The brain of a child (age 5-8yrs) can absorb 2x the radiation of an adult.2

Exposure in bone marrow can be up to 10x greater than an adult.3

Outcomes in children may be worse as:

Children have systems which are still developing.

Children have a longer time ahead for latent effects to manifest.

It is noteworthy that brain tumours have overtaken leukaemia as a leading cause of cancer death in young people.

Published Research

Fernández, C., de Salles, A., Sears, M., Morris, R., & Davis, D. (2018). Absorption of wireless radiation in the child versus adult brain and eye from cell phone conversation or virtual reality. *Environmental Research*, *167*, 694-699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.05.013

Siervo B, Morelli MS, Landini L, Hartwig V. Numerical evaluation of human exposure to WiMax patch antenna in tablet or laptop. *Bioelectromagnetics*. 2018;39(5):414-422. doi:10.1002/bem.22128

P. Gandhi, "Yes the Children Are More Exposed to Radiofrequency Energy From Mobile Telephones Than Adults," in IEEE Access, vol. 3, pp. 985-988, 2015, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2015.2438782.

Gandhi, O., Morgan, L., de Salles, A., Han, Y., Herberman, R., & Davis, D. (2011). Exposure Limits: The underestimation of absorbed cell phone radiation, especially in children. *Electromagnetic Biology And Medicine*, *31*(1), 34-51. https://doi.org/10.3109/15368378.2011.622827

Ferreira, J., & Almeida de Salles, A. (2015). Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) in the head of Tablet users. *The 7Th IEEE Latin-American Conference On Communications (Latincom 2015)*, *1538*, 5-9. Retrieved 3 June 2020, from http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1538/paper-02.pdf.

E. Fernández-Rodríguez, A. A. A. De Salles and D. L. Davis, "Dosimetric Simulations of Brain Absorption of Mobile Phone Radiation–The Relationship Between psSAR and Age," in IEEE Access, vol. 3, pp. 2425-2430, 2015, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2015.2502900.

Gultekin, D., & Moeller, L. (2012). NMR imaging of cell phone radiation absorption in brain tissue. *Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences*, *110*(1), 58-63. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1205598109

Cabot E, Christ A, Bühlmann B, et al. Quantification of RF-exposure of the fetus using anatomical CAD-models in three different gestational stages. *Health Phys*. 2014;107(5):369-381. doi:10.1097/HP.0000000000000129

Gadi Lissak. "Adverse physiological and psychological effects of screen time on children and adolescents: Literature review and case study." Environmental Research, Volume 164, 2018, Pages 149-157, ISSN 0013-9351.

Byun, Y., Ha, M., Kwon, H., Hong, Y., Leem, J., & Sakong, J. et al. (2013). Mobile Phone Use, Blood Lead Levels, and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Symptoms in Children: A Longitudinal Study. *Plos ONE*, *8*(3), e59742. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059742

Foerster, M., Thielens, A., Joseph, W., Eeftens, M., & Röösli, M. (2018). A Prospective Cohort Study of Adolescents' Memory Performance and Individual Brain Dose of Microwave Radiation from Wireless Communication. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *126*(7), 077007. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp2427

Mohammed B, Jin J, Abbosh A, Bialkowski K, Manoufali M, Crozier S. Evaluation of children exposure to electromagnetic fields of mobile phones using age-specific head models with age-dependent dielectric properties. IEEE Access. PP(99). 2017

Sangün Ö, Dündar B, Çömlekçi S, Büyükgebiz A. The effects of electromagnetic field on the endocrine system in children and adolescents. Pediatr Endocrinol Rev. 2015 Dec;13(2):531-45.
Aldad, T., Gan, G., Gao, X., & Taylor, H. (2012). Fetal Radiofrequency Radiation Exposure From 800-1900 Mhz-Rated Cellular Telephones Affects Neurodevelopment and Behavior in Mice. *Scientific Reports*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00312
Li, D., Chen, H., Ferber, J., Hirst, A., & Odouli, R. (2020). Association between maternal exposure to magnetic field nonionizing radiation during pregnancy and risk of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in offspring in a longitudinal birth cohort. *JAMA Network Open*, *3*(3), e201417. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.1417
Miller, A., Sears, M., Morgan, L., Davis, D., Hardell, L., Oremus, M., & Soskolne, C. (2019). Risks to health and well-being from radio-frequency radiation emitted by cell phones and other wireless devices. *Frontiers In Public Health*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00223
Hardell, L. (2017). Effects of mobile phones on children's and adolescents' health: A commentary. *Child Development*, *89*(1), 137-140. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12831
Clegg, F., Sears, M., Friesen, M., Scarato, T., Metzinger, R., & Russell, C. et al. (2020). Building science and radiofrequency radiation: What makes smart and healthy buildings. *Building And Environment*, *176*, 106324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106324
Zarei, S., S., Mortazavi, S., Mehdizadeh, A., Jalalipour, M., Borzou, S., & Taeb, S. et al. (2015). A Challenging Issue in the Etiology of Speech Problems: The Effect of Maternal Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields on Speech Problems in the Offspring. *Journal Of Biomedical Physics & Engineering*, *5*(3), 151-154. Retrieved 2 June 2020, from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4576876/.
Markovà, E., Malmgren, L., & Belyaev, I. (2010). Microwaves from mobile phones inhibit 53bp1 focus formation in human stem cells more strongly than in differentiated cells: Possible mechanistic link to cancer risk. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, *118*(3), 394-399. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0900781
Sudan, M., Birks, L., Aurrekoetxea, J., Ferrero, A., Gallastegi, M., & Guxens, M. et al. (2018). Maternal cell phone use during pregnancy and child cognition at age 5 years in 3 birth cohorts. *Environment International*, *120*, 155-162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.07.043
Roda, C., & Perry, S. (2014). Mobile phone infrastructure regulation in Europe: Scientific challenges and human rights protection. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *37*, 204-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2013.09.009
Divan HA, Kheifets L, Obel C, Olsen J. Cell phone use and behavioural problems in young children. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2012;66(6):524-529. doi:10.1136/jech.2010.115402
Herbert, M.R. and Sage, C. "Autism and EMF? Plausibility of a Pathophysiological Link". Part 1:Pathophysiology , 2013, Jun;20(3):191-209, Pubmed abstract for Part 1.
Herbert, M.R. and Sage, C. "Autism and EMF? Plausibility of a Pathophysiological Link". Part II: Pathophysiology, 2013 Jun;20(3):211-34. Epub Pubmed abstract for Part II.
Papageorgio, C.C., et al. "Effects of Wi-Fi signals on the p300 component of event-related potentials during an auditory hayling task." Journal of Integrative Neuroscience, vol. 10, no. 2, 2011, pp. 189-202.

IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Non-ionizing radiation, Part 2: Radiofrequency Electromagnetic fields. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer, vol. 102, 2013.

https://ehtrust.org/research-on-childrens-vulnerability-to-cell-phone-radio-frequency-radiation/

Health Impacts of Screens

Concerns about the potential vulnerability of children to radio-frequency electromagnetic radiation (RF-EMR) fields is increasing as children's exposure to wireless devices is on the rise. Children are considered potentially more vulnerable to RF-EMR fields because of the susceptibility of their developing nervous system. Additionally, their brain tissue is more conductive, consequently allowing more RF-EMR penetration relative to the size of their head. Moreover, they will be exposed to RF fields for more years than adults (Kheifets et al., 2005). For years researchers believed that non-heating RF-EMR radiation could not cause harm. Evidence which links RF radiation to cancer were published by the National Toxicology Program (NTP) of the U.S. National Institute of Health, which released partial findings from its cell phone study on rats."

Scientific Research on Health Effects of Screens and Smartphones to Children - Environmental Health Trust

The FCC, as the agency with the authority to adapt appropriate exposures exposure guidelines, has failed to recognize the unique vulnerabilities of children.

The responsibility needs to deleted from the FCC's purview.